

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP  
B. Trent Webb, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
Peter Strand, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
Ryan D. Dykal Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613  
Telephone: (816) 474-6550  
Facsimile: (816) 421-5547  
[bwebb@shb.com](mailto:bwebb@shb.com)

Robert H. Reckers, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
600 Travis Street, Suite 3400  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 227-8008  
Facsimile: (713) 227-9508  
[rreckers@shb.com](mailto:rreckers@shb.com)

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
Mark A. Perry (*pro hac vice*)  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-5306  
Telephone: (202) 955-8500  
[mperry@gibsondunn.com](mailto:mperry@gibsondunn.com)

Blaine H. Evanson (*pro hac vice*)  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 229-7000  
[bevanson@gibsondunn.com](mailto:bevanson@gibsondunn.com)

GREENBERG TRAURIG  
Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086)  
Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)  
Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)  
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Suite 400 North  
Las Vegas, NV 89169  
Telephone: (702) 792-3773  
[tratosm@gtlaw.com](mailto:tratosm@gtlaw.com)  
[roosb@gtlaw.com](mailto:roosb@gtlaw.com)  
[godfrey1@gtlaw.com](mailto:godfrey1@gtlaw.com)

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP  
W. West Allen (Nevada Bar No. 5566)  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Tel: (702) 949-8200  
[wallen@LRLaw.com](mailto:wallen@LRLaw.com)

RIMINI STREET, INC.  
Daniel B. Winslow (*pro hac vice*)  
6601 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 300  
Pleasanton, CA 94566  
Telephone: (925) 264-7736  
[dwinslow@riministreet.com](mailto:dwinslow@riministreet.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Rimini Street, Inc., and Seth Ravin*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;  
ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware  
corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL  
CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;  
SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL

**DEFENDANTS RIMINI STREET,  
INC.'S AND SETH RAVIN'S REPLY IN  
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
EXPERT TESTIMONY OF  
ELIZABETH A. DEAN**

Trial Date: September 14, 2015

1 Oracle's proposed expert, Elizabeth Dean, offered two alternative methods of calculating  
2 damages resulting from Rimini Street's purported copyright infringement. Her primary analysis  
3 calculated a hypothetical license worth over \$200 million, and her alternative analysis calculated  
4 lost profits at under \$100 million. Dkt. 566; Declaration of Robert H. Reckers ("Reckers Decl."),  
5 Ex. A, Dean Rep. at 26 (Table 5). Her analysis under both theories was deeply flawed, and  
6 therefore Rimini Street moved to exclude Ms. Dean's testimony relating to these two  
7 methodologies in its *entirety*. Dkt. 563. In its Opposition Brief, Oracle *abandoned* its hypothetical  
8 license theory – the over \$200 million hypothetical license – as well as its income approach,  
9 claiming that it has done so to “streamline the issues for trial.” Opp. 2:14-19. Given this  
10 concession, the only theory for copyright infringement damages even available to Oracle at trial is  
11 for lost profits, though that theory should be excluded as well for the reasons set forth in Rimini's  
12 opening brief and as further explained in this Reply.

13 Significantly, Ms. Dean *admitted* in her expert report that [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED]  
16 [REDACTED]  
17 [REDACTED]  
18 [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED]  
20 [REDACTED]

21 As foreshadowed by her own admissions, Ms. Dean's lost profits calculation is  
22 fundamentally unreliable and should be excluded because her analysis of any “causal link” between  
23 copyright infringement and lost profits is purely “speculative.” *Polar Bear Prods., Inc. v. Timex*  
24 *Corp.*, 384 F.3d 700, 708-10 (9th Cir. 2004); *Good Tech. Corp. v. MobileIron, Inc.*, 2015 WL  
25 3882608 (N.D. Cal. June 23, 2015). Rather than include in her calculation only those customers  
26 that left Oracle because of alleged infringement by Rimini Street, Ms. Dean devised a vastly over-  
27 inclusive model for determining which lost customers to include, such as *every* Oracle customer  
28 that became a Rimini Street customer. Ms. Dean ignored that many customers [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED]  
3 Failing to address these clear flaws in Ms. Dean's analysis, Oracle's Opposition resorts to  
4 mischaracterizing Rimini Street's arguments, asserting that Rimini Street is seeking "a ruling that  
5 Oracle cannot prove causation, as a matter of law." Opp. 1:14-18. Not so. Rimini Street is asking  
6 this Court to exclude Ms. Dean's lost profits testimony, *because* the causation analysis disclosed in  
7 her report is unreliable and irrelevant and therefore inadmissible under *Daubert v. Merrell Dow*  
8 *Pharms.*, 43 F.3d 1311, 1320-22 (9th Cir. 1995), *remanded from* 509 U.S. 579 (1993). Whatever  
9 *other* evidence Oracle can present to demonstrate causation at trial is not the subject of the present  
10 motion.

11 Oracle also misstates the applicable legal standard, claiming in a footnote that it need not  
12 satisfy a "but for" causation test. See Opp. 11:15-28. That is incorrect. Ninth Circuit authority is  
13 clear that Oracle bears the burden of demonstrating it would have earned the allegedly lost profits  
14 *but for* the infringing activity. *Polar Bear*, 384 F.3d at 710; *Mackie v. Rieser*, 296 F.3d 909, 914  
15 (9th Cir. 2002); see *Hamil Am., Inc. v. GFI*, 193 F.3d 92, 108 (2d Cir. 1999) ("In the absence of  
16 convincing evidence as to the volume of sales that plaintiff would have obtained but for the  
17 infringement, the measure of lost profits may be rejected as too speculative") (quoting 4 Melville  
18 B. Nimmer and David Nimmer, *Nimmer on Copyright* § 140.02[A], at 14-11 (1996)). And "mere  
19 speculation does not suffice to link the losses to the infringement" to satisfy that burden. *Polar*  
20 *Bear*, 384 F.3d at 710; *cf. also Panduit Corp. v. Stahl Bros. Fibre Works, Inc.*, 575 F.2d 1152 (6th  
21 Cir. 1978) ("To obtain as damages the profits on sales he would have made absent the infringement  
22 ..., a patent owner must prove ... the absence of acceptable noninfringing substitutes").<sup>1</sup>

23 But speculation is all that Ms. Dean offers here. Indeed, Dean's report is riddled with  
24 speculative assertions (ignored in Oracle's Opposition), none of which are sufficiently reliable such

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Indeed, the existence of a non-infringing alternative throughout the period of infringement, which is  
27 not addressed here, is directly relevant to Oracle's burden to prove "but for" causation and will  
likely be a highly contested issue at trial.

1 that a jury could reach a verdict in Oracle's favor based on that evidence. For example, Dean

2 [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED]  
6 [REDACTED]  
7 [REDACTED]  
8 [REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED] this speculation is insufficient to establish a "causal  
10 link between the infringement and" "lost profits" as a matter of law. *Polar Bear*, 384 F.3d at 708;  
11 see also *Crunchyroll, Inc. v. Pledge*, 2014 WL 1347492, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2014) ("It is  
12 entirely speculative" to assume that customers of infringer "would have" "automatically" become  
13 customers of copyright holder absent infringement given customer preferences unrelated to  
14 infringement). Rather, where, as here, the plaintiff cannot show that the loss of (or failure to gain) a  
15 particular customer is attributable to infringement, it "cannot recover damages related to [that]  
16 customer." *Polar Bear*, 384 F.3d at 708.

17 Oracle contends that Rimini Street does not challenge two out of three "components" of  
18 Dean's lost profits analysis: (i) discounts Oracle gave to customers to prevent them from defecting,  
19 and (ii) money Rimini Street *would have* paid Oracle to use its Database software. Opp. 2:3-13.  
20 This, too, is false. Oracle cannot recover for these categories of damages absent a showing of  
21 causation that any customers left Oracle because of Rimini Street's infringement, which it has not  
22 demonstrated. Similarly, Oracle is incorrect that Rimini Street does not challenge Dean's analysis  
23 of a hypothetical license with respect to the Oracle Database. Opp. 2:14-19. Rimini Street's  
24 motion challenged the *entire* hypothetical license damages calculation, including the Oracle  
25 Database. Dkt. 563 at 9:7 ("Dean's entire value of use calculations rely upon projections and  
26 expectations"), 1:10-12 (challenging entire damages figure). And Oracle's conclusory assertion  
27 that its Database "benchmark" is non-speculative and admissible ignores the non-infringing

1 alternatives available to Rimini Street, and ignores Rimini Street's arguments that Dean improperly  
2 assumed unreasonable economic behavior for all aspects of the hypothetical license claims. Dkt.  
3 563 at 13:9-23. It also completely ignores the fact that the Ninth Circuit has never affirmed a  
4 hypothetical license award in a lawsuit between two competitors.

5 Finally, Oracle's repeated plea that the Court should deny Rimini Street's motion because it  
6 goes to the weight of the evidence, and not its admissibility, rings hollow. Ms. Dean should not be  
7 permitted to testify on matters that could not support a jury verdict as a matter of law. *Polar Bear*,  
8 384 F.3d at 710 (reversing jury verdict and remanding for new trial because lost profits award was  
9 based on "pie-in-the-sky" speculative expert testimony). Such testimony is irrelevant and therefore  
10 inadmissible under Rule 702. *See Daubert*, 43 F.3d at 1320-22. And in any case, the Court should  
11 enter an order excluding evidence related to a hypothetical license and income approach, given that  
12 Oracle has abandoned those theories, and it will not be part of Dean's testimony or the upcoming  
13 trial.

14 Rimini Street therefore respectfully requests that this Court exclude any expert testimony of  
15 Ms. Dean with respect to lost profits and fair market value damage theories.

16  
17 DATED: July 9, 2015

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON

18 By: /s/ Robert H. Reckers  
19 Robert H. Reckers, Esq.  
20 Attorney for Defendants  
21 Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27